

## Chapter

# 1

# INTRODUCTION TO SECURITY COOPERATION

## INTRODUCTION

The term security cooperation was first introduced in 1997 by the Defense Reform Initiative (DRI). At that time, the Defense Security Assistance Agency (DSAA) already had day-to-day management responsibilities of many security assistance programs authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) and the Armed Export Control Act (AECA). The DRI proposed that DSAA also manage certain Department of Defense (DoD)-funded international programs along with their personnel and associated resources. In order for U.S. government (USG) agencies, the private sector, and foreign governments to better understand DSAA's enlarged mission and diverse functions beyond security assistance (SA), DoD re-designated DSAA as the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), effective 1 October 1998.

In recent years, DSCA has absorbed management responsibilities for many DoD international programs while also leading the wider USG security cooperation enterprise. However, many security cooperation programs continue to be managed by other elements of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the combatant commands (CCMDs), or the military departments (MILDEPs). Further complicating the management of security cooperation was the in-country point of contact between the USG and the host nation. This point of contact was either the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)-sponsored Defense Attaché Office (DAO) or the DSCA-sponsored Security Cooperation Office (SCO). These two spigots of security cooperation within a country required a broad knowledge and skill baseline of the very different international programs that are initiated, funded, and managed throughout the DoD, its agencies and the MILDEPs. Most disconnects regarding SCO-DAO coordination of in-country security cooperation were generally resolved with the establishment of the Senior Defense Officials/Defense Attaché (SDO/DATT) having oversight over both the SCO and DAO organizations.

On 9 June 2004 that DoD published a formal, yet still very broad, definition of security cooperation in Joint Pub 1-02:

All DoD interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access to a host nation.

DODD 5132.03, DoD Policy and Responsibilities Relating to Security Cooperation, 29 December 2016, further defines security cooperation with assigned responsibilities:

All DoD interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests, develop allied and partner nation military and security capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access to allied and partner nations. This includes DoD-administered security assistance programs.

According to Title 10 U.S. Code Section 301, the term “security cooperation programs and activities of the Department of Defense” means any program, activity (including an exercise), or interaction of the DoD with the security establishment of a foreign country to achieve a purpose as follows: (A) To build and develop allied and friendly security capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations. (B) To provide the armed forces with access to the foreign country during peacetime or a contingency operation. (C) To build relationships that promote specific United States security interests. Other DoD policy statements identify DoD-managed or administered security assistance programs as components of security cooperation.

The purpose of this first chapter is to provide definitions of the various programs within security assistance and the broader area of security cooperation.

## **SECURITY ASSISTANCE**

Over the years, security assistance has included programs authorized by the FAA or AECA. According to the FAA, as amended, the term “Security Assistance” means military assistance, economic support funding, military education and training, peacekeeping operations, anti-terrorism assistance, sales of defense articles or services, export to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other international security forces of a foreign country. While many of these programs are administered by the DoD, specifically by DSCA, they remain under the general control of the Department of State (DoS).

### **Foreign Military Sales**

The foreign military sales (FMS) program is a non-appropriated program administered by DSCA through which eligible foreign governments purchase defense articles, services, and training from the USG. The purchasing government pays all costs associated with a sale. There is a signed government-to-government agreement, normally documented in a Letter of Offer and Acceptance (LOA), between the USG and a foreign government. Each LOA is commonly referred to as a “case” and is assigned a unique case identifier for accounting purposes. Under FMS, military articles and services, including training, may be provided from DoD stocks (Section 21, AECA) or from new procurement (Section 22, AECA). If the source of supply is new procurement, based on an LOA accepted by the foreign government, the USG agency or MILDEP assigned cognizance for this case is authorized to enter into a subsequent contractual arrangement with U.S. industry to provide the article or service requested.

FMS is a large program with the final FMS total for FY 2020 being \$50.8 billion. This includes \$2.69 billion in Title 10 grant assistance programs.

### **Foreign Military Construction Services**

Foreign Military Construction Services (FMCS) is a non-appropriated program administered by DSCA and authorized by Section 29, AECA, which designates the President to sell design and construction services to any eligible foreign country or international organization. The construction sales agreement and sales procedures generally parallel those of FMS and are usually implemented by the MILDEP civil engineering agencies.

### **Foreign Military Financing Program**

The Foreign Military Financing Program (FMFP) is an appropriated program administered by DSCA that has undergone a variety of substantive and terminological changes over the years. At present, the program consists of congressionally appropriated grants and loans, which enable eligible foreign governments to purchase U.S. defense articles, services, and training generally through FMS, or direct commercial sales (DCS) for select countries. Foreign military sales credit (FMSCR) is authorized under the provisions of Sections 23 and 24, AECA, and originally served to provide credit (loans) as an effective means for easing the transition of foreign governments from grant aid, e.g., Military Assistance Program (MAP) and International Military Education and Training (IMET), to

cash purchases.

Prior to FY 1989, the USG variously identified this financing program as the Foreign Military Sales Credit Program or the Foreign Military Sales Financing Program. In the FY 1989 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act (FOAA), Congress introduced a new title, the FMFP, and further identified the forgiven loan/forgiven credit component of the program as FMFP grants to distinguish them from repayable direct FMFP loans. Additionally, the terms non-repayable loans or non-repayable credits are often used by various security assistance organizations (including DSCA) in place of the term “FMFP grants.”

Beginning in FY 1992, the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-508) changed the method of accounting and budgeting for all government loans, including FMFP loans issued under the AECA. This legislation provides a more accurate portrayal of the true cost of loans by providing new budget authority only for the subsidy element of the loan program and is the basis for the establishment of two new financial accounts:

- The first contains only the FMFP grant portion of the program administrative costs.
- The second account provides the budget authority needed to fund the subsidy element of the proposed loan programs.

While there are previously authorized FMFP loans still being repaid to the USG, the FMFP grant element (no repayment) has become the norm.

Over the past several years, per the Presidential Policy Directive 23 of April 2013 (PPD 23), new FMF pilot programs have been established under the authority of Section 23 of the AECA—the Foreign Military Financing Challenge Fund (FMFCF) and Foreign Military Financing Regional Funds (FMFRF). The FMFCF is intended to provide one-time investments for special projects for a partner nation that has demonstrated political will to pursue reform efforts, contribute to common goals, and build lasting, self-sustaining capabilities. The FMFRF provides flexibility and responsiveness in implementing portions of the FMF program based upon geographic region. For example, in FY 2016, \$5 million was provided for the FMF European Security Assistance Fund (ESAF). Through a competitive proposal system, these FY 2016 ESAF funds are available for countries in Europe and Eurasia that have received bilateral FMF within the five fiscal years prior to submission.

FMFP funding for FY 2020 was \$6.15 billion. FMFP appropriations are generally grants repayable or non-repayable loans.

## **Leases**

Chapter 6, AECA, authorizes the President to lease defense articles to friendly governments or international organizations for up to five years (renewable). This non-appropriated program is administered by DSCA. The law allows the lease of defense articles only for compelling foreign policy or national security reasons, and stipulates the recipient, with some exceptions, must bear the full cost of the lease. Furthermore, the U.S. must not need the leased articles during the lease period, and the U.S. retains the right to terminate the lease at any time. For the recipient country, leases may be cheaper than purchasing the article outright, and they provide a convenient vehicle for obtaining defense articles for temporary use. Leases are executed through a lease agreement, with an associated FMS case to cover repair, training, supply support and/or transportation, if required.

## **Military Assistance Program**

In FY 1990, the Military Assistance Program (MAP) was formally merged with the FMFP as Congress adopted an administration proposal for integrating all MAP grant funding into the appropriations account for the FMFP. DSCA administered this appropriated program. However, Congress has not

appropriated MAP funds for subsequent fiscal years, and there is no interest in seeking any such funds for the future. Therefore, this legislative charge had the dual effect of causing existing MAP-funded programs to lose their former identity and become FMFP-funded programs and establishing the FMFP as the major U.S. financing program for the acquisition of U.S. defense articles and services by foreign governments.

MAP remains a current security assistance program because MAP-provided articles remain throughout the world. As such, these articles retain their End-Use Monitoring (EUM) requirements: their return to the USG when no longer needed and the return to the USG any proceeds from scrapping or sale to a third country.

### **International Military Education and Training**

The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program provides grant financial assistance for training in the U.S. and, in some cases, in overseas facilities to selected foreign military and civilian personnel. In earlier years, grant aid training of foreign military personnel was funded as part of the MAP appropriation. Starting with FY 1976, a separate authorization for IMET was established in Section 541, FAA. DSCA administrates this appropriated program. Although historically a relatively modest program in terms of cost, both the President and Congress attach significant importance to this program. The recipient countries, likewise, rely heavily on this grant program and, in many cases, serve as the only method to receive training from the U.S. military.

At a time of competition for resources, IMET advances U.S. objectives globally at a relatively small cost. In many countries, having a core group of well-trained, professional leaders with firsthand knowledge of America will make a difference in winning access and influence for our diplomatic and military representatives. Thus, a relatively small amount of IMET funding will provide a return for U.S. policy goals, over the years, far greater than the original investment.

In 1980, Section 644(m)(5), FAA, was amended to authorize IMET tuition costing in terms of the additional costs that the USG incurs in furnishing such assistance. Section 21(a)(1)(C), AECA, was also amended to allow IMET recipients to purchase FMS training on an additional cost basis. The practical effect of these changes was to reduce tuition costs substantially for IMET-funded students, thereby increasing the amount of training an eligible country can obtain by using both national funds for FMS purchases and allotted IMET grant funds.

### **Expanded IMET**

The FY 1991 Foreign Operations Appropriation Act (FOAA) introduced an IMET initiative via a Senate-proposed earmark of \$1 million to be used exclusively for expanded IMET courses for foreign officers. Congress later allowed this initiative to include civilian managers and administrators of defense establishments. The focus of such training is on developing professional-level management skills, with emphasis on military justice systems, codes of conduct, and the protection of human rights. Congress amended Section 541, FAA to permit non-Ministry of Defense civilian government personnel to be eligible for this program, if such military education and training would do the following:

- Contribute to responsible defense resource management
- Foster greater respect for and understanding of the principle of civilian control of the military
- Contribute to cooperation between military and law enforcement personnel with respect to counter-narcotics law enforcement efforts
- Improve military justice systems and procedures in accordance with internationally recognized human rights

In FY 1993, Congress further extended this expanded IMET (E-IMET) program to also include participation by national legislators who are responsible for oversight and management of the military. Through P.L. 104-164, Congress again amended the E-IMET program authority in 1996 to also include non-governmental organization personnel.

In the 2019 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Congress appropriated \$111 million for IMET for 2019. In FY 2020, \$112 million was appropriated and \$113 million in FY 2021 by the Further Consolidation Appropriations Act of 2021.

### **Drawdowns and Special Presidential Waiver Authority**

During a crisis, Section 506, FAA, authorizes the President to provide USG articles, services, and training to friendly countries and international organizations at no cost, to include transportation and spares. There is a \$100 million ceiling per fiscal year on articles, services, and training provided for military purposes and another fiscal year ceiling of \$200 million for articles, services, and training required for non-military purposes such as disaster relief, nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, counter-narcotics, refugee assistance, and Vietnam War-era prisoners of war/missing in action (POW/MIA) location and repatriation. When emergency support for peacekeeping operations is required, Section 552(c)(2), FAA, separately authorizes the President to drawdown up to \$25 million per fiscal year in USG articles and services from any agency. Special drawdown authorities have been annually legislated in the State Department and Foreign Operations Appropriation Acts (S/FOAA). When the USG avails DoD defense articles, services, or training via drawdowns, DSCA administers these non-appropriated authorities.

### **Economic Support Fund**

The Economic Support Fund (ESF) is authorized by Chapter 4 of Part II of the FAA. ESF is an appropriated program administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Congress established this fund to promote economic and political stability in areas where the U.S. has special political and security interests and where the U.S. has determined that economic assistance can be useful in helping to secure peace or to avert major economic or political crises. ESF is a flexible economic instrument available on a grant basis for a variety of purposes, including balance of payments support, infrastructure, and other capital and technical assistance development projects in addition to funding a variety of programs to enhance political stability. In earlier years, the ESF program included concessional (i.e., low interest rate) loans as well as grants; recently, all ESF funds receive allocation as grant assistance. While a substantial amount of these ESF grants are used to provide balance of payments, the ESF also provides for programs aimed at primary needs in health, education, agriculture, and family planning. Where long-term political and economic stability is the primary concern, ESF finances projects that meet the basic needs of the poor.

In the 2019 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Congress appropriated \$2.5 billion for ESF for 2019. The FY 2020 appropriations were \$3 billion but decreased in FY 2021 to \$2 billion.

### **Peacekeeping Operations**

Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) is an appropriated program authorized by Chapter 6 of Part II of the FAA. For several years, PKO provided funds for the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO), which implemented the 1979 Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty and the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). Subsequent funding has been provided to support peacekeeping efforts in the Balkans, East Timor, sub-Saharan Africa, and the Darfur region of the Sudan, South Sudan, and Somalia.

### ***Global Peace Operations Initiative***

Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI), which has become the principal PKO program, was originally a Presidential initiative in coordination with other G-8 countries to increase the capacity of



selected countries to deploy in support of international peacekeeping operations. It was envisioned as a five-year program (FYs 2005–2009) to train seventy-five thousand troops worldwide, with emphasis in the Africa region and building an African command headquarters capability. GPOI supports the deployment of peacekeepers by providing equipment, transportation, training, and sustainment in the field. A DoS program requiring DoD support, GPOI subsumed the previous SA-funded PKO Africa Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) program and the FMFP- funded Enhanced International Peacekeeping Capabilities (EIPC) program. The ACOTA term is still used when referring to the Africa training component of GPOI.

In the 2019 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Congress appropriated \$163 million for PKO for 2019. The FY 2020 Act appropriated \$457 million. In FY 2021, this number decreased to \$441 million. All PKO appropriations are grants managed by the DoS.

### **International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement**

The International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) program is an appropriated grant program which the DoS administers. Authorized by Section 481, FAA, INCLE is intended to suppress the worldwide illicit manufacture and trafficking of narcotic and psychotropic drugs, money laundering, and precursor chemical diversion, and the progressive elimination of the cultivation of any crops from which such drugs are derived. Recently, the elimination of related narco-terrorism has been included. This program can include the purchase of defense articles, services, and training. This is similar to the authorized and funded programs within DoD and the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security.

The 2019 Consolidated Appropriations Act appropriated \$1.49 billion for INCLE. The FY 2020 appropriations were slightly reduced to \$1.39 billion. The FY 2021 appropriations were further reduced to \$1.38 billion.

### **Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs**

The DoS administers a series of appropriated grant programs collectively known as the Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related (NADR) programs. Part II, Chapters 8 and 9 of the FAA and Section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act authorize NADR. Additionally, Section 23, AECA, for NADR focuses on demining activities, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, the destruction of small arms, border security, and related activities. Related defense articles, services, and training can be provided through this program. U.S. funding support for the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Preparatory Commission is provided through this program. The DoD role in this program is that DoS can purchase demining, unexploded ordnance clearance, and anti-terrorism systems with this funding.

In the 2018 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Congress appropriated \$655 million for NADR for 2018. The FY 2019 appropriation was for \$864 million. In FY 2020, Congress appropriated \$895 million. In FY 2021, Congress appropriated \$889 million.

### **Direct Commercial Sales**

Direct Commercial Sales (DCS) are commercial exports of defense articles, services, and training licensed under the authority of Section 38, AECA, made by U.S. defense industry directly to a foreign government. Unlike the procedures employed for FMS, DoD does not administer DCS transactions, and a DCS sale does not normally include a government-to-government agreement. Rather, the DoS Directorate of Defense Trade Controls (PM/DDTC) implements the required USG controls through licensing. The International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) [22 CFR 120-130] contains the day-to-day rules and procedures for Direct Commercial Sales.

The DoS grants regulatory approval for over \$136 billion worth of sales requests per year. Of

note, not all license approvals will result in signed contracts and actual deliveries. Like FMS, DCS deliveries are likely to take place years after U.S. industry obtains the export license from PM/DDTC and the interested parties sign the commercial contract.

## **Other Security Assistance Programs**

### ***Excess Defense Articles***

Excess defense articles (EDA) identified by the MILDEP or DoD agency are authorized for sale using the FMS authority in Section 21, AECA, and FMS processes identified within the Security Assistance Management Manual (SAMM) for property belonging to the USG. Prices range from 5 to 50 percent of original acquisition value, depending on the condition of the article.

Additionally, Section 516, FAA, authorizes the President to transfer EDA on a grant basis to eligible countries (annually identified within a joint DoD/DoS letter to Congress). While EDA can be transferred at no cost, the recipient must typically pay for any transportation or repair charges. Under certain circumstances, transportation charges may be waived, with the cost absorbed by DoD-appropriated funds.

### ***Third-Country Transfers***

Section 3(d), AECA, authorizes the President to manage and approve the transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles from the original recipient country to a third country. Requests for third-country transfers are normally approved if the USG is willing to conduct a direct transfer to the third country. Countries must obtain third-country transfer authority in writing from the DoS in advance of the proposed transfer. This applies to all U.S.-origin defense articles regardless of the method of original transfer from the USG or U.S. industry. More can be found on this subject in the chapter on End-Use Monitoring and Third-Party Transfers.

## **SECURITY COOPERATION**

While all of the programs previously mentioned are authorized under 22 U.S.C (Title 22), and are under the general control of the Department of State (DoS), the Department of Defense (DoD) administers many of them. Title 10 U.S. Code Section 301 defines security cooperation programs and activities of DoD as any program or interaction of U.S.C. with the security establishment of a foreign country to build capabilities, provide access or build relationships. As such, many of the previously described FAA and AECA-authorized security assistance programs administered by the DoD, in accordance with the SAMM, fall under the broad definition of security cooperation. The following is a categorization of programs, and a brief explanation, based upon a partial list presented in the 2016 DoD Guidance for Security Cooperation. For more detail on the different programs that can be found under each category, access and download the *Security Cooperation Programs* book found on the DSCU website or use the SC Programs Viewer on the Security Assistance Network Web (SANweb).

### **Train and Equip/Security Cooperation: DoS Administered Title 22**

This category includes security assistance programs previously identified and described, and these programs are normally implemented and managed by DoS, USAID, or both. While under the authority of DoS, DoD provides material assistance and related training to partner nations to develop specific capabilities and/or capacities. These programs are authorized by either the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) (22 U.S.C. 2151, et. seq.) or the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) (22 U.S.C. 2751, et. seq.):

- Direct Commercial Sales (DCS)
- Drawdowns
- Economic Support Fund (ESF)

- Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI)
- International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE)
- Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR)
- Peacekeeping Operations (PKO)
- Third-Country Transfers

### **Train and Equip/Security Assistance: DoD-Administered Title 22**

This category includes security assistance programs previously identified and described. While under the authority of DoS, DoD provides materiel assistance and related training to partner nations to develop specific capabilities and/or capacities. These programs are also authorized by either the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) (22 U.S.C. 2151, et. seq.) or the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) (22 U.S.C. 2751, et. seq.):

- Excess Defense Articles (EDA)
- Foreign Military Financing Program (FMFP)
- Foreign Military Sales (FMS)
- Foreign Military Construction Services (FMCS)
- International Military Education and Training (IMET)
- Leases
- Military Assistance Program (MAP)

### **Train and Equip/Security Cooperation: Title 10 Programs**

Under the authority of Title 10, Chapter 16, and/or the current National Defense Authorization Act, DoD provides material assistance and related training to partner nations to develop specific capabilities and/or capacities. This is normally done using DoD Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding, but, in some instances, Congress appropriates additional funding for DoD to conduct these programs. Although it is DoD funding, these programs, and all security cooperation, must be coordinated with DoS. Security Cooperation practitioners refer to these programs as Building Partner Capacity (BPC) programs and execute them using a pseudo Letter of Offer and Acceptance. All BPC programs require congressional notification. Below are just a few examples. Examples with four digits in quotes represent temporary authorities whose authorizations can be found in various National Defense Authorizations Acts.

- “1022” Authority to Provide Counterdrug (CD)-Funded Support to Law Enforcement Agencies
- “1206” Training of Security Forces and Associated Security Ministries of Foreign Countries to Promote Respect for the Rule of Law and Human Rights
- “1226” Support to Certain Governments for Border Security Operations
- 333, Foreign Security Forces: Authority to Build Capacity
- Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF)
- European Deterrence Initiative (EDI)



- Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF)
- Counter ISIS Train and Equip Fund (CTEF)
- Indo-Pacific Maritime Security Initiative (MSI)

### ***Operational Support***

Operational support assistance programs are designed to enable partner countries to participate in coalition operations by developing specific capabilities needed for said operations. Alternately, they might focus on enhanced interoperability among partner countries and sustain partner operations in cases where partner countries cannot sustain operations on their own. These are normally done using DoD O&M funding and congressionally appropriated funds. These programs, and all security cooperation, must be coordinated with DoS. Below are just a few examples:

- “1234” Logistics Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Certain U.S. Military Operations
- “1207” Cross Servicing Agreements for Loan of Personnel Protection and Personnel Survivability Equipment in Coalition Operations
- “1233” Coalition Support Fund (CSF)
- 331, Friendly Foreign Countries: Authority to Provide Support for Conduct of Operations
- Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA)
- Coalition Readiness Support Program (CRSP)

### ***Defense Institution Building (DIB)***

DIB, as per the 27 January 2016 DoD Directive 5205.82, is the development and capacity building of partner nation defense institutions, normally at the ministerial or chief of defense level, in support of U.S. foreign policy and security cooperation goals. According to this directive, DIB attempts to promote principles vital to the establishment of defense institutions that are effective, accountable, transparent, and responsive to national political systems, especially regarding good governance, oversight of security forces, respect for human rights, and the rule of law.

Some areas of focus for DIB are defense institutions, organizations and processes that can ensure effective oversight, management, and execution of logistics, personnel, budgets, policy, strategy, and doctrine for effective development, employment, and sustainment of defense capabilities.

DIB is authorized and funded under Title 10, Section 332, Friendly Foreign Countries; International and Regional Organizations: Defense Institution Capacity Building to bring into the Partner Nation (PN) both full-time resident advisors and long-term, episodic Subject Matter Expert teams. Funding from other programs can also be used for DIB related training, education, and professional development.

### ***International Armaments Cooperation***

International Armaments Cooperation (IAC) can best be described as U.S. bilateral and multilateral agreements with partner countries focused on three cooperative areas. First, to share the costs associated with the cooperative research, development, test, evaluation, and production of mutually required weapons systems or components, defense technologies, systems, or equipment; second, to foster joint production and follow-on support of defense articles or equipment; and, third, to procure foreign technology, equipment, systems or logistics support. Over time, a variety of names have been applied to this area of cooperation to include Armaments Cooperation, International Armaments Cooperation (IAC), International Armaments Cooperation Programs (IACP), and Defense Cooperation

in Armaments (DCA). Chapter 13 of this book provides more information on this topic. Below are just a few examples:

- Information Exchange Program (IEP)
- 311, Exchange of Defense Personnel Between United States and Friendly Foreign Countries
- Test and Evaluation Program (TEP)
- Foreign Comparative Testing (FCT) Program
- Cooperative Research, Development, and Acquisition Programs
- Defense Trade
- Cooperative Logistics

### ***Humanitarian Assistance***

Humanitarian assistance consists of a group of security cooperation programs designed to improve DoD access, visibility, and influence in a partner nation (PN) or region and to build the capacity of the PN government while addressing a humanitarian need. Combatant commands (CCMDs) may carry out activities funded by Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid (OHDACA) across respective Unified Command Plan (UCP) theaters, offering DoD another tool to promote regional stability and security. Requests for OHDACA funds for any of these programs are generally initiated by the in-country SCO. The CCMD then consolidates and prioritizes before forwarding to DSCA for any required coordination with DoS/USAID and the military departments. It should be noted that the DoS has parallel programs generally managed by USAID in response to any requests by the affected U.S. embassy responding to country requirements. DoS and USAID annually receive even more funding for overseas humanitarian, disaster, and migration assistance programs. Below are just a few examples:

- Center for Excellence in Disaster Management & Humanitarian Assistance (CFE-DM)
- Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP)
- Excess Property as Humanitarian Relief
- Foreign Disaster Relief (FDR)
- Humanitarian Assistance Transportation Program (HATP)
- Humanitarian and Civic Assistance (HCA) during Military Operations
- DoD Humanitarian Assistance (HA)
- Humanitarian Daily Rations (HDR)
- Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA)
- Space-A Transport of NGO Relief

### ***Education***

There are many security cooperation programs that provide education opportunities to PN military and civilian personnel. Training can take place in the U.S., in the PN's country and in some cases in a third country. Training can include professional military education, tactical training, and/or technical skills training when they acquire new equipment from the U.S. Below are just a few examples:

- “1206” Training of Security Forces and Associated Security Ministries of Foreign Countries to Promote Respect for the Rule of Law and Human Rights
- 342, Regional Centers for Security Studies (RCSS)
- 345, Regional Defense Combating Terrorism and Irregular Warfare Fellowship Program (CTIWFP)
- 346, Distribution to Certain Foreign Personnel of Education and Training Material and Information Technology to Enhance Military Interoperability with the Armed Forces
- 347, International Engagement Authorities for Service Academies
- 348, Aviation Leadership Program (ALP)
- Attendance at the USCG Academy

### ***Exercises***

Combined exercises are exercises between the U.S. forces and those of one or more countries. It is common error to refer to these exercises as multinational, coalition, or joint operations, but this is doctrinally incorrect. It should be noted that the term “joint” refers to two or more services, e.g., Army and Air Force. Exercises can be both joint and combined, while most combined exercises are single-service combined exercises. The primary purpose of combined exercises is the training of U.S. forces, emphasizing interoperability and capability building, though the host nation also benefits from the training as well. There are three types of exercises that may fall under this title:

- Field Training Exercises (FTX): These are the most realistic of exercises, taking the form of actual forces in the field, thus allowing all the moving parts to be tested. These are also the most resource intensive in money, manpower, material, and preparation time.
- Command Post Exercises (CPX): An exercise in which the forces are simulated, involving the commander, the staff, and communications/coordination among the participating headquarters.
- Table Top Exercises (TTX): Tabletop exercises are the least resource-intensive of these three types, ranging from a formal, detailed planning process to a simple discussion. TTXs are excellent when senior leaders want to explore a number for possible scenarios or possible futures.

Below are just a few examples of security cooperation exercise programs and related activities:

- “1251” Training for Eastern European National Security Forces in the course of Multilateral Exercises
- 321, Training with Friendly Foreign Countries: Payment of Training and Exercise Expenses
- 322, Special Operations Forces: Training with Friendly Foreign Forces
- Defense Health Program
- Exercise-Related Construction (ERC)
- Joint Exercise Program

### ***Contacts***

There can be some confusion about the definition of contact events and/or Military-to-Military (M2M) events. In the past, Section 168 of Title 10 provided authorization for contact events and/

or Mil-to-Mil events. However, part of NDAA 2017, Section 168, was repealed, and these types of events are now authorized under Chapter 16 of Title 10, specifically Subchapter II Military-to-Military Engagements. One of the most important things to remember is that events conducted under this authority should not cross into the training realm. They should be designed to enable defense and military leaders to engage with partner countries for discussions, exchanges of tactics, planning, and other purposes that encourage democratic orientation of defense establishments and military forces of other countries; but not training. Contacts are largely conducted between U.S. military and civilian defense personnel and the military and civilian defense personnel of a partner country but may also include non-defense personnel of partner countries who play key security roles. Events, normally, but not always, fall into one of these categories:

- Traveling contact teams
- Familiarization visits
- Military liaison teams
- Seminars and conferences held primarily in a theater of operations
- Distribution of publications primarily in a theater of operations
- Personnel expenses of DoD personnel as they relate to above activities

Below are just a few examples of the authorities under which DoD conducts contact events:

- 311, Exchange of Defense Personnel between United States and Friendly Foreign Countries: Authority
- 312, Payment of Personnel Expenses Necessary for Theater Security Cooperation
- 342, Regional Centers for Security Studies (RCSS)
- 344, Participation in Multinational Military Centers of Excellence

An organization that might be involved in supporting contact events is the National Guard, which is part of the Department of Defense State Partnership Program (SPP), which is authorized under 10 USC 341 (Title 10, Chapter 16, subchapter V). More on this later in this chapter.

## ***Exchanges***

There are a variety of options for conducting exchanges of military and civilian defense personnel with partner countries that may be used to develop familiarity with partner country systems, processes, interoperability, and technical expertise. There can be exchanges of civilian or military personnel between DoD and ministries of defense. There can be exchanges of military personnel between units of U.S. armed forces and foreign armed forces. There can also be exchange of personnel on a nonreciprocal basis. Below are just a few examples of the authorities under which DoD conducts exchanges:

- 311, Exchange of Defense Personnel Between United States and Friendly Foreign Countries: Authority
- Reciprocal, No-charge Flight Training School
- Reciprocal, No-charge Professional Military Education (PME) Student Exchanges
- Reciprocal, No-charge Unit Exchanges

## **SECURITY FORCE ASSISTANCE**

Lessons learned from the combat activities and subsequent foreign government reconstitution efforts in Southwest Asia drove the Department of the Army (HQDA) and U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to develop a new concept of operations titled Security Force Assistance (SFA). HQDA FM 3-07.1, “Security Force Assistance,” May 2009 (superseded by FM 3-22, Army Support to Security Cooperation, 22 January 2013), is the first document to define SFA as the unified action to generate, employ, and sustain local, host-nation or regional security forces in support of a legitimate authority. The following year, Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 5000.68 of 27 October 2010 titled “Security Force Assistance” established DoD policy for SFA and assigned responsibilities. The directive restated the definition of SFA to be DoD activities that contribute to the unified action by the USG to support the development of the capacity and capability of foreign security forces (FSF) and their supporting institutions.

Moving from tactical to strategic levels, SFA is engagement at the tactical and operational level, Defense Institution Building (DIB), as part of Institutional Capacity Building (ICB), is engagement at the operational (ministerial) level and Security Sector Assistance (SSA) is engagement at the strategic, whole-of-government level.

According to the April 2013 Presidential Policy Directive 23 (PPD 23), strategic-level SSA aims to strengthen the ability of the U.S. to help allies and partner nations build their own security consistent with the principles of good governance and the rule of law across their government. The DoS has the lead on SSA and convenes the Interagency SSA Oversight Board, which they co-chair with DoD. SSA objectives with a PN should reflect the objectives of the respective U.S. embassy’s Integrated Country Strategy (ICS). In this respect, SSA is a coordinated USG effort focused on helping countries fight alongside U.S. forces countering terrorist and international criminal networks, participate in international peacekeeping operations, and maintain law and order in their respective countries.

SFA encompasses all of the activities required to develop a FSF, identifying and generating needed functions from the leadership level of the PN ministry of defense down to the entry-level private. The FSF and the broader terms of the security sector encompass the military, paramilitary, police, intelligence forces, border police, coast guard, customs officials, prison guards, and correctional personnel that provide security for a partner nation and its relevant population or support a regional security organization’s mission. U.S. DoD civilians, contractors, conventional, and Special Operations Forces can be the providers of SFA. As a subset of DoD security cooperation, SFA draws from multiple security cooperation programs to include security assistance (Title 22) for resources.

That said, there are parameters for what SFA is and, more clearly, what does not qualify as SFA. 3-07.1 states that (1) the mere provision of defense articles without related training is not SFA, (2) military exchange programs are not SFA, (3) humanitarian assistance and civic action are not SFA, and (4) joint exercises are not SFA. Combined operations must include U.S. forces as advisors, mentors, partners, or augmenters within FSF units to be SFA, and not U.S. units conducting independent operations alongside FSF.

In summary, as part of security cooperation activities, SFA, DIB, and SSA all work together at their respective levels with our partner nations toward strengthening their FSF capabilities while also supporting U.S. national security goals and achieving DoD security cooperation end states.

## **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (SPP)**

As previously mentioned, Section 341, Department of Defense State Partnership Program (SPP) allows the National Guard of U.S. states and territories to interact and exchange personnel with civil, military, and emergency/disaster response personnel of friendly partner nations. Many of these same partner nations will have an assigned Bilateral Affairs Officer (BAO) from the National Guard state



partner leading and managing the SPP effort and coordinating other mil-to-mil events. The National Guard partner may also conduct humanitarian assistance and training events when authorized.

The National Guard's involvement reflects an evolving international affairs strategy using the unique civil-military nature of the National Guard to interact with both civil and defense personnel of foreign countries. The state partners actively participate in a host of engagement activities, e.g., bilateral familiarization and training events, emergency management, environmental remediation exercises, fellowship-style internships, educational exchanges, and civic leader visits. All activities are coordinated through the CCMD and the U.S. Ambassador's country team, and other agencies, as appropriate, to ensure that National Guard support is tailored to meet both U.S. and country objectives. Table 1-1 illustrates the partnerships.

All state National Guards have an SPP coordinator who manages the program from the state National Guard headquarters. This program also includes the exchange of authorized National Guard personnel with military forces, security forces, or other government organizations of a country whose primary functions include disaster or emergency response.

Typically, funding of SPP activities is not availed unless the activity is jointly approved by the applicable combatant command and chief of mission/ambassador. The National Guard members must be on active duty to use these funds. National Defense Authorization Acts (NDAA's) issue annual changes, and it is imperative to check with respective CCMDs for the latest guidance.

**Table 1-1**  
**DoD State Partnership Program Partners**  
**50 states, 3 territories, and District of Columbia**



## SUMMARY

Security assistance has been part of our nation's history ever since the Revolutionary War. Since World War II, the USG has progressively institutionalized and leveraged security assistance as a tool to advance U.S. interests in a global environment.

The term security assistance itself is subject to differing interpretations. The relatively recent development and use of the term security cooperation, which incorporates DoD-managed security assistance programs, has become the standard to describe all DoD international activities.

If the past is any predictor of the future, security cooperation will be in existence for many years to come. In this regard, the words of former Deputy SecDef, William P. Clements, Jr., are as appropriate today as when they were spoken years ago:

Many contend that such a program [as security assistance] has outlived its usefulness and is an anachronism in these days of a trend towards détente. To do so is not only to misread the history of the past twenty-five years but to misinterpret the signs of the times. The record is open to all who care to consult it. That record fully substantiates the conclusion that the world situation in which we currently find new hope for the future would not exist if the people of the United States had earlier refused to concern themselves with the common defense of the Free World. Had we not become involved and, for more than two decades, supported and encouraged the efforts of allied and friendly countries to protect themselves against threats to their territorial integrity and internal security, the complexion of the globe might be dangerously different today, and the international climate far more hostile. [*Commander's Digest*, July 12, 1973]

The above 1973 historical quote highlights the evolution of SC and underscores the extraordinary changes to SC issued by the FY 2017 NDAA. The increasing scope of SC activities to include all DoD international programs and those FAA/AECA-authorized programs administered by DSCA is testament to increased DoD policy responsibilities and the imperative to develop the SC workforce. Execution of foreign policy in terms of SC reaches from the Secretary of Defense through DSCA to the CCMD, and finally to the in-country SDO/DATT, DAO, and SCO. Increasingly, almost every community within DoD and its respective leadership is recognizing the role they play in SC and the pivotal role SC plays in achieving U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives.

## REFERENCES

Congress. *National Defense Authorization Act for FY 20xx*.

Congress. *State and Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY 20xx*.

Department of State. *Congressional Budget Justification for Foreign Operations for FY 20xx*.

DSCU Security Cooperation Programs (SCP) Handbook (regularly updated): [https://www.dscu.mil/documents/publications/security\\_cooperation\\_programs\\_handbook\\_2019.pdf](https://www.dscu.mil/documents/publications/security_cooperation_programs_handbook_2019.pdf)

DSCA Manual 5105.38-M. *Security Assistance Management Manual (SAMM)*. Chapters 1, 11, and 12. <http://www.samm.dsca.mil/>.

Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*, Joint Publication 1-02, 12 April 2001, as amended through April 2010.

Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. *United States Military Posture for FY 20xx*.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. *World Armaments and Disarmament: SIPRI Yearbook* (year), New York: Crane, Russak & Co., Inc.

Website of the National Guard Bureau, Office of International Affairs (J5-IA): <https://www.nationalguard.mil/Leadership/Joint-Staff/J-5/International-Affairs-Division/State-Partnership-Program/>